

SALEM HISTORICAL COMMISSION
MINUTES
December 20, 2017

A meeting of the Salem Historical Commission was held on Wednesday, December 20, 2017 at 7:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Jessica Herbert (Chair), Laurie Bellin, Reed Cutting, David Hart, Susan Keenan, Joanne McCrea, and Larry Spang.

132 Essex Street - continuation

The Peabody Essex Museum submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness for proposed renovations to Phillips Library building

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant has requested a continuation to the January 17, 2018 meeting as revised drawings are not ready.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to continue the application to the January 17th meeting. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

175 Federal Street - continuation

Adam Krauth and Nicole Bergman submitted an application for a Certificate of Hardship to alter an attic window on rear elevation.

The applicant was not present.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue the application to the next meeting. Mr. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

4 Federal Court - continuation

Shelly Young submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install vent pipe.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/5/17
- Photographs
- Product specifications

The applicant Shelly Young was not present.

Ms. Kelleher reported that the applicant has spoken with a contractor who stated that the pipe could be inserted through the roof where an existing non-operable mushroom style vent is now located.

Mr. Hart stated that he is familiar with the property and the vent and that he was comfortable approving the change in the vent location.

Other Commission members expressed concern with approving the work without a written statement or drawings of the proposal.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made motion to continue the application to the next meeting. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

5 Carpenter Street - continuation

Kimberley A. Russell submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a window on the rear ell.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 10/30/17
- Photographs

Ms. Kelleher reported that she was unable to reach the applicant to get additional information about existing and proposed windows

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to continue to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

277 Lafayette Street - continuation

In a continuation from a previous meeting, the Commission considered an application from Henry T. Realty for a Certificate of Appropriateness to alter rear porch railings.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/8/17
- Photographs
- Project sketch presented at meeting

The applicant Steve Gagnon was present.

Mr. Gagnon presented drawings of the proposed porch railings at 42” height.

Ms. Herbert asked about the detail of the handrail.

Mr. Spang noted that the handrail detail is shown on the drawing.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approved the porch railings as show in the submitted drawing. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Herbert asked about the lattice installed at the base of the porch.

Mr. Gagnon stated that contractor replaced the lattice without the owner’s approval. The lattice will be replaced to match the previous small diagonal lattice.

Ms. McCrea arrived at this point.

Mr. Spang noted that this type of lattice design would be a replacement in-kind.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to allow replacement of lattice to match previous small diamond pattern. Mr. Spang seconded motion. All in favor and the motion so carried.

16 River Street - continuation

Kevin and Melissa Hankens submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace a window.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/17/17

- Photographs
- Mock-up sketch dated 12/10/17 presented at meeting

The applicant Kevin Hankens was present.

Mr. Hankens presented dimensional drawings and a photo of neighbor's window which would be the same as the proposal. The drawings includes measurements of window from both trim and glass edge.

Ms. Herbert asked about dimensions of frame.

Mr. Hankens stated that it would be 5" wide trim on all sides. He noted that neighboring house has similar square window in the same location on the house. He also noted that other houses in immediate neighborhood have irregular sized windows.

Mr. Spang asked for confirmation that sill is high because of interior counters.

Mr. Hankens replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Bellin noted that earlier drawing did not show all dimensions.

Mr. Hankens presented revised drawing with all dimensions shown. Window will be 28 ½" wide by 17" tall.

Mr. Spang asked if the window will be painted.

Mr. Hankens replied that the window will be painted to match trim.

Mr. Spang asked about the profile of the trim.

Mr. Hankens replied that it would match existing trim.

Ms. Herbert asked if the window will have a storm window.

Mr. Hankens replied in the affirmative.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve window per revised sketch dated 12/10/17 with profile of trim and sill to match trim of window to right and paint to match trim. Mr. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

266 Lafayette Street - continuation

In a continuation from the previous meeting, the Commission reviewed the application from Paul Frederick deNapoli and Tyna Hall for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace garage doors (after the fact)

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 11/8/17
- Photographs

The applicant Fred deNapoli was present.

Mr. deNapoli noted that he was unable to get in touch with his contractor and will ask to continue his gutter application.

Ms. Herbert asked if the contractor is the same contractor that replaced gutters at #268.

Mr. deNapoli replied in the affirmative.

The Commission discussed the porch balusters and railing height and building code requirements.

Ms. Kelleher noted the problems with the newly constructed porch railing at the property across the street at 265-267 Lafayette Street that the Building Inspector has determined does not comply with current building codes.

The Commission agreed to send a letter to the Building Inspector stating their concern with the opinion.

Mr. deNapoli stated that he was not seeking approval of changes to his porch railings at this time. He discussed his current application to approve garage doors as installed. He noted that the previous garage doors were tin and did not work properly. Salem Overhead Door created custom made doors for his property that cost approximately \$20k. He chose a wood color to match historic photo. He stated his preference for a paint color that looked like wood and not a color to match the house, as suggested by the Commission.

Ms. Herbert stated that other owners paint their garage doors to match the trim or body color of the house.

Mr. deNapoli presented the manufacturer's statement that use of a dark paint color would void the warranty for the garage doors. He stated that he initially wanted to use a darker color but chose a lighter color so as not to void warranty.

Mr. Spang asked how the door operates.

Mr. deNapoli replied that the garage doors operates up and does not swing out. He chose hinges to match those in the historic photo.

Mr. Hart noted that the applicant did not replicate double row of windows as shown in the historic photo.

Mr. Spang noted that a double row of windows was probably not possible due to the way the doors operate.

Mr. Cutting noted that the doors are only visible from Lafayette Street at a distance. He expressed his opinion that the house color for the doors would not look as good with the garage and he prefers the wood color as used.

Ms. Herbert expressed her opinion that the existing wood color reads as fake wood.

Mr. deNapoli stated that a darker color would void the warranty.

Mr. Spang agreed that a darker color could result in warping of the wood doors.

Ms. Herbert noted all of the violations for unapproved work undertaken by the previous owner, including the PVC rear deck and the replacement windows in the dormer. She noted that the owner was cited in 2008 for installation of French doors without approval.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to approve garage doors as built and painted. Mr. Hart seconded the motion. All were in favor (Ms. Herbert abstained) and the motion so carried.

Mr. Hart noted that the gutters at #266 are still in existence as well as downspouts.

Ms. Bellin asked about the applicant's Certificate of Non-Applicability application for window restoration work. She questioned whether work qualified for a C of NA and expressed concern that Commission was being asked once again to approve work at the property after it had already been completed.

Mr. deNapoli stated that the work completed was restoration only with replacement cords, sash sanding and repainting, and new replacement glass where needed.

Ms. Kelleher stated her opinion that work was restoration and not alteration and therefore she processed application as a Certificate of Non-Applicability.

Ms. Herbert began discussion on color change and difference in trim color with 268

Mr. deNapoli noted that they did not paint the house. The work was completed by the previous owner.

Mr. Hart agreed that the work on the windows constituted restoration only.

266 Lafayette Street

Paul F.deNapoli and Tyna Hall submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to install aluminum gutters and downspouts.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application:11/24/17
- Photographs

Mr. deNapoli stated his request to withdraw the application for gutter and downspout replacement.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve withdrawal of application without prejudice. Mr. Spang seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Ms. Bellin made a motion to issue a violation letter for gutters and downspouts as installed at 268 Lafayette Street. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Mr. Spang noted that the Commission should not hold up a review of work proposed at #266 due to the violation at #268.

The Commission agreed.

Mr. deNapoli stated that the property deeds are separate for #266 and #268. He reported that the owner of #268 has chosen to work independently.

171 Federal Street

Susan Ellis, Thomas Connelly, Marilyn Levine submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove one chimney.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application:12/4/17
- Photographs

The applicants Susan Ellis and Tom Connelly were present.

A support letter from Ken and Joyce Wallace of 171 Federal Street was read into record.

A support letter from Gianna Delamonica of 173 Federal Street was read into the record.

Ms. Herbert asked if the chimney ends at 3rd floor as stated in the application.

Ms. Ellis responded that she did not know how far the chimney extended in the building since the chimney brick was exposed in the 3rd floor attic but the rest of stack, if present, was hidden behind drywall. She stated that she did not have photographs of the chimney condition. She stated that the chimney did not currently work and other properties on Federal Street have removed chimneys recently.

Mr. Hart presented a photograph of the building that showed the chimney's visibility from Federal Street. He expressed his concern about the loss of one of a pair of chimneys. He noted that chimney probably extended through the building since it would be difficult for it to survive without support in the first and second stories.

Ms. Ellis and Mr. Connelly replied that they were not sure if the chimney base is in fact missing and that it could still be there.

Ms. Bellin asked if the chimney was visible in the third floor.

Ms. Ellis replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Herbert discussed the previous application at 13 Warren Street for the replacement of an existing chimney with a new faux chimney. She noted that the applicant presented documentation to show chimney's structural deficiencies and the estimated cost of \$20,000 to rebuild. She stated that the other recent application to remove chimneys at Griffin Place was approved after the fact due to the fact that roofline on that building had already been altered. She recommended that the applicant consider repointing the chimney above roofline.

Mr. Hart suggested that applicant contact a mason to get the cost for repointing. He suggested John Walsh of the Chimney Company as a resource.

Ms. Kelleher noted that the subject chimney is one of an original pair of chimneys dating the building's original construction.

Mr. Cutting asked if any of the fireplaces were functioning.

Ms. Ellis replied that the fireplace closer to the street was still functioning but the others were not.

Mr. Hart asked Ms. Kelleher to supply the applicant with a list of contractors.

The Commission discussed the removal of the antenna on the chimney.

There was no additional public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness to repair the chimney. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Herbert noted that Ms. Kelleher can provide specifications for mortar.

275 Lafayette Street

Aspire Developmental Services, Inc. submitted an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace signage.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 12/6/17
- Photographs
- Drawings

Liz Busted from the sign company was present on behalf of the applicant.

Ms. Bellin asked if Aspire is a new occupant of the building.

Ms. Busted replied in the affirmative, stating that Aspire is a preschool.

Ms. Kelleher presented the history of the building, noting that it had been built as a chapel for parishioners of St. Josephs who lived in lower South Salem.

Mr. Cutting asked if the logo is for the Aspire franchise.

Ms. Busted replied in the affirmative, stating that Aspire operates preschools in Lynn and elsewhere.

Mr. Cutting asked for the material of the signs.

Ms. Busted replied that signs will be in aluminum.

Ms. Bellin noted that the entry sign is located far back from the street.

There was no public comment.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Spang seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

132-134 Canal Street

Canal Street Warehouse LLC submitted a request to Waive the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish a brick warehouse building.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 12/13/17
- Photographs
- Site plan

144 Canal Street

Canal Furniture LLC submitted a request to Waive the Demolition Delay Ordinance to demolish a two-story warehouse building.

Documents & Exhibits

- Application: 12/13/17
- Photographs
- Site plan

The applicants for both properties, Steve Fienstein and Mark Livesky of Symmes Associates were present.

Ms. Kelleher reported that neither property has been documented on an historic resource inventory form.

Mr. Feinstein stated that believed the buildings to be at least 50 years old. He discussed the proposal for development

at the property. Will be before planning board. The project will be mixed use with 7,000 sf of retail and 20 residential units. The project will be reviewed by the Planning Board as part of a Planned Unit Development. He stated that he represented as owner of all 3 parcels, although each are listed under separate LLCs. He noted that the property at 144 Canal Street is its own parcel. All of the subject parcels will be combined and a pocket park will be added along with a connection to the bike path under construction at the rear. 134 Canal Street will have a 5' walkway from Canal Street to the rail trail and the development will tie into the infrastructure improvements in progress. He noted that this section of Canal Street has turned into retail corridor.

Ms. Herbert asked for clarification on the development timeline.

Mr. Feinstein reported that the project will be before the Planning Board on January 4th. He noted that the drawings presented to the Commission are the same as those submitted to the Planning Board.

Ms. Bellin asked for clarification on the property addresses.

Mr. Feinstein noted that City lists the properties as 132-134 Canal Street and 144 Canal Street. He presented a site plan showing where the new development will occur and which buildings on the property will be retained. He noted that 10% of the residential units will be affordable.

Ms. Herbert asked whether the project will require design review.

Mr. Feinstein replied that design review is not required but the project will need to file with the Conservation Commission since it is located in a flood zone. The project will also require site plan review since there will be a drive-through.

Ms. Herbert offered design advice from the Commission.

Mr. Spang suggested that the development could be more ambitious and provides an opportunity to develop a new vision for Canal Street. He recommended the applicant look at alternative ways to develop the site without the proposed large expanse of paved parking area, which continues the current suburban look of Canal Street.

The Commission and the applicants discussed the potential for development on Canal Street with the bike path and the potential for a new commuter rail station.

Ms. Herbert suggested that the Commission consider withholding the waiver of the demolition delay to ensure that applicant work with the Commission on a better design.

Mr. Cutting questioned whether the buildings are historically significant.

Mr. Spang expressed concern about how lot will be treated when the buildings are demolished.

Ms. Kelleher asked if the buildings will be removed before the development is ready.

Mr. Feinstein replied that they may wait to demolish the buildings while Planning Board approval is pending.

Mr. Livesky replied that there are some concerns with safety of the buildings if they are left vacant on the site.

Mr. Feinstein reiterated his desire to make a development for which the owner and the city can be proud. He stated that the applicant designed the project to be compatible with existing streetscape of Canal Street with its current retail uses.

Mr. Hart asked if there was a way to tie the Commission's approval into other permitting processes. He asked whether it was premature to approve demolition if other boards have not issued approval for the development.

Mr. Feinstein replied that withholding the waiver request would prohibit the owner's ability to remove unsafe buildings and would require the owner to continue to purchase flood insurance for the buildings.

Mr. Hart asked if there is documentation that the buildings are unsafe.

Mr. Livesey replied that there was no documentation but the condition of the buildings is apparent.

Ms. Herbert suggested that the Commission conduct a site visit to see the property and then could offer advice on the new development.

Mr. Feinstein replied his concern that the owner's proposed design of the project would probably not meet the expectations of the Commission for historic appearance.

Mr. Cutting stated his opinion that the photographs indicate that the safety concern is apparent.

Ms. Keenan suggested that the Commission may be overstepping their jurisdictional boundaries.

Mr. Spang expressed his opinion that while the buildings may not be worth preserving, he was concerned about how the site would be left after the demolition occurs, noting that past developments have left vacant lots with large holes in the ground. He offered to work with the applicants on ideas for how the new development could improve the site.

Mr. Hart suggested the Commission add a proviso to the waiver of the demolition delay ordinance requiring the vacant lot to be leveled and not left with an open hole.

Mr. Spang asked if the Commission could also add a proviso that land be seeded and loamed.

Ms. Herbert asked for public comment.

Ms. Joyce Kenney of Lafayette Street reported that the land downtown noted by the Commission will become a municipal parking area. She expressed concern about hazardous material in the buildings to be demolished.

Mr. Feinstein replied that hazardous waste abatement will be done prior to demolition.

VOTE: Mr. Spang made a motion to grant waiver of demolition delay ordinance for both buildings with conditions that applicant provide photographic documentation of all elevations of each building with ¾ views and that building footprint areas be leveled, seeded and loamed and landscaped on Canal Street until such time that site is developed.

Mr. Hart made an amendment for vertical dimensions of existing buildings as well as perimeter dimensions as well as color photographic digital of buildings.

Reed seconded the motion but questioned the need for irrigation and maintenance of a seeded site.

Mr. Spang cited a long history in the city of demolished sites becoming an eyesore.

Mr. Feinstein suggested condition that prior to demolition planning board approval must be granted. He stated that if condition added to seed site, then would prefer to keep building intact until development.

Ms. Bellin suggested that applicant retain buildings on site until expected start of development in March or April then would not need to seed and loam site.

VOTE: Mr. Hart made a motion to waive the demolition delay with the provisos noted. Mr. Cutting seconded the motion. Five members were in favor, with Ms. Keenan in opposition, and the motion so carried.

Ms. Herbert suggested that applicants could come back with alternate plans for site preparation.

VOTE: Mr. Cutting made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Bellin seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Kelleher
Community Development Planner